

Appn. No.: 09/755,027
Reply to Office Action of April 26, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of April 26, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-71 were previously cancelled. Claim 74 has been cancelled by the present amendment. Claims 72, 75-77, 87, 88, 94, 100 and 101 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 72, 73 and 75-101 remain pending after entry of the present amendment. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter with respect to claims 87, 94-97, 100 and 101. Applicant has amended claims 87, 94, 100 and 101 into independent form and thus claims 87, 94, 100 and 101 are now in condition for allowance. Claims 95-97 are dependent on claim 94 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 94.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 72-101 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Alriksson *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,977,938, hereinafter “Alriksson”). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 72 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein one or more replies to a route request sent from the new sink establishes a bi-directional, optimal path between the mobile node and one or more of the active peers.” Nowhere does Alriksson teach or suggest such a feature. At most, Alriksson discloses a dynamic source routing method whereby a network may be flooded with route request messages for discovering routes to a certain destination. Col. 3, ll. 15-29. Even so, Alriksson lacks any teaching or suggestion that the route request originates from a new sink and that one or more replies to such a route request from the new sink establishes a bi-directional path between the mobile node and one or more active peers, as is recited in claim 72. Applicant further notes that the above recited feature of claim 72 is also a feature of claim 87, which the Office Action indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Claim 72 is thus allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Appn. No.: 09/755,027
Reply to Office Action of April 26, 2006

Claims 73, 75-86, 88-93, 98 and 99 are dependent on claim 72 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 72 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: August 28, 2006

By: /Chunhsing Andy Mu/
Chunhsing Andy Mu, Reg. No. 58,216

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001